Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 8 1966
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

No. 918

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1965

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO, ET AL., *Petitioners*

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

REPLY TO BRIEF FOR THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD IN OPPOSITION

SCHOENE & KRAMER
1625 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

LESTER P. SCHOENE
MILTON KRAMER
MARTIN W. FINGERHUT

918 Marine Bank Building
Tampa, Florida

RICHARD H. FRANK

Counsel for Petitioners

PRINTED BY BYRON S. ADAMS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1965

No. 918

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO, ET AL., *Petitioners*

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

---

REPLY TO BRIEF FOR THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD IN OPPOSITION

The Brief in Opposition misdescribes the questions presented by this controversy:

1. The first question does not pertain to the "labor organization" status of the Internationals as Respondent states. Rather, the question is whether those rail-

way labor units, representing exclusively railroad employees and engaged solely in a railroad dispute in which they have complied with all provisions of the Railway Labor Act are to be subjected to the additional restrictions of the N.L.R.A. by reason of the characteristics of the Internationals.

2. The second question does not pertain to any substantial evidence issue. Rather the question is the legal one whether unions that represent only railroad employees and admittedly are not "labor organizations" under the N.L.R.A. have their rights in a dispute subject to the Railway Labor Act diminished by the N.L.R.A. on account of being associated in a common cause with other railway unions whose internationals include nonrailroad employees.

Having thus misdescribed the questions tendered for review, respondent's brief then discusses these spurious issues and fails to respond to the Petition.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHOENE & KRAMER
1625 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

LESTER P. SCHOENE
MILTON KRAMER
MARTIN W. FINGERHUT

918 Marine Bank Building
Tampa, Florida

RICHARD H. FRANK

Counsel for Petitioners

March 8, 1966